



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

who are straight. These are they who are pious.

With this from the Koran may be placed the simple statement of the

prophet Micah: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God."

THE VALUE OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY (*Concluded*)

REV. G. H. RICHARDSON, PH.D.
Bunker Hill, Illinois

This brings us back to the moderate-liberal position. If I were asked what a moderate liberal is, I should say: A moderate liberal is one who believes that in the Bible of the Jews and Christians there is the record of a unique revelation of God in history and religious life, the record being far from perfect in material and structure; but, being purely secondary to the truth enshrined, it is open to the critical scrutiny of scholars who have a perfect right to apply the same method of criticism to this record as is applied to all records, particularly the ancient.

It cannot be questioned that many pagan as well as uncritical Jewish ideas attach to our views of the Bible. When the Christian church took over the Old Testament it took too many Jewish and pagan theories with it, and these have too long been hanging like a millstone round the neck of biblical studies. What we need now is to get rid of the paganism and the uncritical Jewish theories.

Having made this brief statement, let us ask: What is necessary in our

treatment of archaeology in order that we may be able to derive the utmost benefit from it?

1. We must understand what the monuments contain. This sounds like a commonplace, but it is surprising how many writers on all sides overlook it. Here we are at the mercy of the specialist, unless we are competent to read for ourselves. Here we must listen to the unprejudiced report of the textual or historical expert. We say expert, for only he has a right to pronounce, and particularly where a difference of reading is possible. It is both unwise and unfair to rush off with a few words from a monument, etc., just because they seem to support our views; for it is more than probable that they will have an entirely different meaning when read in the light of their whole context. An archaeological fact, like a biblical text, needs to be read in its own context, and the context is often more than the preceding or succeeding verse.

2. We must fully learn the age of the monuments, and the age of the events recorded. It would be an easy matter

to name more than one theory rife today which is rife because elements from a number of lands and ages have been scraped together, and, after being edited, made to appear like one whole and complete system, when all the time it is a mongrel. This is particularly the danger of the comparative mythologist and the student of comparative religion, as more than one recent book bears out. If we had always been told when certain monuments were erected, when certain beliefs were held, and when certain events took place, certain theories could never have gained ground, because the very dates would have disproved them. As a notable instance of this we mention the whole pan-Babylonian theory.

3. We must accept the conclusion that, even though archaeology gives the historical setting into which the biblical narrative looks as if it would fit, it is not the same as having proved the biblical account. One would think this needless warning, and yet it is only too painfully present in a number of otherwise valuable books. Archaeology alone can give the historical setting of scripture. But when it has done this, it has usually gone as far as it can. How differently this is understood! We are told by a leading conservative "that archaeologists, as such, almost with one consent look askance at criticism as vague and not above suspicion." And yet another has an article under the heading: "Why Archaeologists Distrust the Higher Criticism." Apart from the misstatement made by both these writers, it would have been well if we had been told whether these archaeologists are as authoritative in criticism as in archaeology, or whether

they are merely amateurs in criticism. If they are amateurs, their opinion here has merely the weight of amateurish opinion. But what of those leading archaeologists who are at the same time leading critics? Even yet there appears to be a lamentable ignorance on the part of would-be champions of orthodoxy as to where the issues lie. An "examiner in languages" of a certain presbytery in the Middle West, a "specialist in classics and formerly instructor in Greek" in a Canadian university, surprised some of his listeners when, giving a lecture on "Jesus Christ as a Higher Critic," he boldly declared that Winckler, among others, has "now concluded to accept the whole Old Testament as the inspired Word of God, until it is proven to be false by facts and not by supposition," the suppositions in this case being the whole of the higher criticism. The historical setting is one thing, but the historical details are another. If Professor Petrie has found the tombs of the First Dynasty in Egypt, this does not prove the historicity of Menes. If Sir Arthur Evans has unearthed the palace at Knossos and brought to light the remains of a wonderful civilization, this does not prove that Minos is historical, nor that all the details told of him are historical. If Schliemann did discover one or two cities at the site of ancient Troy, that does not prove the *Iliad* to be correct. And yet such claims are being given out by a number of books and articles of late. In order that it may be seen that we are not criticizing for the sake of criticism, and in order that we may not be accused of "making" criticism, allow us to quote from a much, and rightly,

praised book.¹ "Surely the warnings of the study of Egyptian and classical history and literature are not to be disregarded. Menes and other kings of Egypt were declared by criticism to be mere mythological characters; Minos of Crete was relegated to the same limbo; and the stories of Troy and her heroes were said to belong to 'cloud-land.' . . . Has the label 'myth,' which criticism has fastened to anything in sacred or classical story, more or better critical argument to support it than had the opinion that these kings and heroes were only the creatures of romancing fancy? Yet the spade of Petrie at Abydos, of Evans at Knossos, and of Schliemann at Troy has revealed the 'cloudland' as solid earth and shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood."

Has Petrie found Menes? Has Evans found Minos? Have the heroes of Troy been found? To each question we must give a decided negative. The setting only has been given, but the heroes are missing.

It does not follow that because there was an Elamitic dominance of Babylonia about the time of the earlier years of Hammurabi, and because annual raids were made by the kings of that age, a "great army" led by four kings was routed by "a few men" in "a brilliant and successful campaign" as is found in Gen., chap. 14. To be told that "not all the allies in the campaign to Palestine are known certainly as yet" is to be misled, unless one knows the

present state of archaeology in this matter. The fact is *not one of the allies has been identified so far.*

To find the ruins of a site identified as in existence at the (traditional) time of a patriarch, e. g., Tel el Yehudieh does not prove the historicity of the patriarch nor any details told concerning him. Neither does it say anything for or against a mythical element in the story. Nothing so far discovered in Egypt proves or disproves the biblical narratives of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though there is much which makes impossible the traditional account of the work of Moses and of the Exodus. Hence, to be told that there is a "voluminous mass of evidence for Israel's relations with the Egypt of the Nile Valley" is to be told what is not correct, the statement being a gross exaggeration. This is said as a rebuke to the ultra-conservatives.

To argue that because Muzri is found on the monuments all the references to Egypt (Mizraim) in the Old Testament are due to a wrong pointing of the text under the influence of a late political relation is unwarrantable. No doubt some things can be said in favor of North Arabia and its relations to Israel, but historical setting, resemblance, similar beliefs, etc., are not the same as evidence. To argue that because some of the Old Testament stories are paralleled in Babylonian literature the Old Testament is Babylon spiritualized is unwarrantable. We have to distinguish between historical setting and

¹ Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*. If the writer of this interesting and instructive volume will pardon me, I shall venture to say that he has too often accepted the illustration as confirmation, thus marring the usefulness of the book for those who are seeking a scientific statement as derived from the monuments.

historical details. Because the setting makes an event probable it does not of necessity make the event actual. This is said as a rebuke to the ultra-liberal.

4. We must not make the mistake of believing that it is enough to pit one scholar against another when the archaeological facts are against our theories, arguing that because the views of one scholar have (supposedly) undermined those of another our views are thereby proved correct. It has been a source of wonder to some how scholars could ever content themselves with such a method, and yet it is not with any unkindly spirit that we have to state that this is peculiarly a method employed by conservatives. Zumpt has challenged Mommsen regarding Quirinius, hence the virgin birth of Jesus is unquestionable; Harnack, Soltau, and others disagree as to whether there is a pagan element in the birth stories, hence the conservative view is proved correct, seeing that these writers undermine the theories of one another; Winckler has challenged Wellhausen and Eerdmans has challenged both, hence Wellhausen's theories are pulverized, and thus the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship has been vindicated. Sayce, Clay, and Orr have challenged Noldeke and Driver regarding Gen., chap. 14, hence the chapter must be thoroughly reliable, being copied, probably, from a Babylonian tablet written after the armies reached Babylon or Elam.

But would it not be well to ask before we go on so fast whether the challengers have proved their separate cases? Let it be granted that they have proved their own cases, have we not yet to deal with the theories of the challengers? If

Zumpt is correct in his reading of the monuments, will this support Luke, or still cause difficulties when we come to read his account? If Winckler is correct, and if Eerdmans is correct, are the conservatives willing to take these teachers as guides, and are we all pledged to accept their views as correct after dropping Wellhausen? Shall we not have to turn round and disprove the theories of Winckler before we are settled? When there are at least three theories in the field, it does not follow that number one is correct because number three has attacked and routed number two. Number three is still left, and, if the cases cited are to be judged, it is often more dangerous than the routed one. And yet we recall quite a few books in which this is the method employed.

5. We must understand that the facts of archaeology must be accepted, no matter how they bear on our theories. It is grossly unfair to tell the world how archaeology vindicates at every step the traditional view of the Bible because some illustration has been found for our theory, and yet to tell the world that "it must wait for all the facts in the case," for "further light from the monuments," or that "archaeology is not yet an exact science," when it supports the critical view. Take the case of the Book of Daniel. What loud acclamations were heard over the land when the name of Belshazzar was discovered on a cylinder! How remarkably God had vindicated his Word against the attacks of the critics! Daniel was a faithful record of events as they happened. No longer could the historian say that Belshazzar never lived. No longer could

the critic say that the book was an apocalyptic work. If the name of Belshazzar had been discovered, that proved that Belshazzar had lived; and, if he had lived, who could say at this late age that any of the things said of him in Daniel were incorrect? But what quibbles and evasions, what angry disputes and attacks these were, when it was found that Belshazzar was not a son of Nebuchadrezzar! It could not even be proved that he was a distant relative of this king or any of the king's family. What arguments were written on the indefinite use of the term "son"! What theories were worked out to prove that probably the mother of Belshazzar was a daughter or near or distant relative of Nebuchadrezzar! And how the pages were covered with "probably," "it is quite possible," "it is not improbable," "we can well believe," etc! What searching of the records when it was found that Babylon was taken "without fighting and without a battle," and that history knows nothing of "Darius the Mede"! Had he not two names? Was not Gobryas the name he had at home and Darius the name he had in Babylon? Was not the term "king" used as indefinitely as "son"? Has it not been shown that there are five Assyrio-Babylonian words meaning, in Aramaic, "king"? Three of these denote subordinate rulers, and any of them might be rendered into Hebrew by "king." In fact, has it not been "proved" that "king" sometimes means little more than mayor of a city? Hence there is nothing improper in calling Gobryas (Darius) and also Belshazzar a king. What a prophet of God Canon Sayce was when he had discovered certain

things supporting traditionalism! But how "even such a great scholar can be carried away at times with strange theories" when he wrote the chapter on Daniel in *Higher Criticism and the Monuments!*

To tell the world, when archaeology is supposed to be supporting the critical view of the Bible, that the supposition is "based upon a misconception of facts," that "the foundations upon which these [critical] theories rest . . . totally disappear" when tested by archaeology, that "not a single reconstructive theory has been sustained by the results of archaeology," is either to prove one entirely ignorant of the whole field of archaeology and criticism, or to prove that one has such a bias that he is rightly to be ruled out of court when he attempts to express an opinion. Nothing is to be gained by evasion, misreporting, burying one's head in the desert of obscurantism, or by any similar method. Facts are stern things and must be faced and dealt with, and to deny a fact is not to alter it nor to put it out of existence.

These are but a few of the things we must do in dealing with archaeology. There are other points perhaps as necessary as those above named, but these we leave to the student. And when we have thus dealt with the facts, what shall we find that is of value?

To many people archaeology is suggestive of what is dry, dead, and uninteresting. It suggests mummies, "curios," and kindred things, such as one finds in the cases in the museums. It is all this and more. There are some to whom archaeology is one of the most fascinating of studies, particularly as it has a bearing on the biblical records.

What is the value of archaeology, then, for the Bible student?

1. It gives us back the people among whom the Bible grew. It gives us back the life, literature, customs, manners, religions of the people among whom Israel lived its life. If all commentators, preachers, and Bible-class leaders had once fully grasped the fact that the Bible is an oriental book, written by Orientals of the long ago, much trouble would have been prevented, and the Bible would not have suffered so much in the house of its friends. It was born in the East and comes to us clothed in an eastern form and imagery. East is East and West is West, and a westerner cannot understand the Bible as it is unless he divests himself as much as possible of his western ideas of book-making and book-writing. Only by living over again the life of the Oriental, and thinking his thoughts, can we understand him. This is why it is so helpful to study the Orient of today. "It is emphatically true that a knowledge of Palestine, its customs and ways of thought, is indispensable for a proper understanding of the Bible."

But here a caution is necessary. Because a knowledge of the Orient is indispensable, it does not follow that all you find there is a "proof" of the Bible. One will find some wonderful illustrations of things he finds in the Bible, but illustration is not confirmation. In spite of the fact that the saying that the East is immovable is an oft-repeated one, it is not correct. The East does move. In spite of its conservatism it cannot escape the influence of western manners and ideas even though it should try.

Still one can, by going off the highway, find much which practically brings him face to face with the condition one reads of in the Bible. It is this Palestine off the beaten track which is so helpful for study.

2. It gives back the environment, historically and geographically, in which the Bible grew. So many excavations have been made in the lands of the Bible during the past fifty years that it does at times appear that the whole of these lands will be uncovered and all their monuments brought to light. Today we can walk about the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh and Ur. We can see the ancient life of Hamath, Carchemish, Jerusalem, Gezer, Lachish, Gath, Maresah, Megiddo, Taanach, Jericho, Samaria, Beth-Shemesh, and Capernaum, to mention only a few of the ancient sites excavated, sites mentioned in the Bible. As the result of the excavations we see as never before the world in which Israel lived and moved and had its being. To see again the very scenes witnessed by the ancients; walk over the very streets and paths upon which they walked; gaze on the buildings in which they lived and worshiped; handle again their pottery and furniture, household utensils, weapons, jewelry, ornaments, and the images of their gods—this is to feel that the ancient world is real, and we live again the life of those we study.

One must understand the historical and geographical conditions under which Israel lived its life if he would understand the story of Israel, and these conditions are revealed to us by archaeology. It would be well if all Bible students could be led to see the value of a thor-

ough knowledge of biblical geography. This is considered a very dry and uninteresting study by many, but it is absolutely necessary if one would understand the significance of many of the biblical narratives. It is not too much to say that the biblical narratives cannot be fully understood, and that many of the historical details lose all significance when the geography of Canaan is unknown. Let the student work through *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, written by Principal George Adam Smith, or through the smaller volume by Professor Kent, and he will find that after all the study is fascinating in spite of its name; in fact, he will find that his Bible is more wonderful than he had hitherto thought.

3. It is the final court of appeal in all matters of ancient history. "Archaeological evidence alone can be applied to the settlement of historical disputes." Every student of history knows what wonderful theories have been advocated from time to time, theories built on the flimsiest foundations. Who has not read many interesting theories regarding the ancients which archaeological discoveries have wiped off the slate at a stroke? We think of Niebuhr rewriting the history of Rome in the light of archaeological facts, a rewriting which caused Ewald to consider the history of Israel more thoroughly and finally to rewrite it. What theories were taught and accepted regarding the early history of Greece! How many, even leading scholars, accepted myth with history just because the means were not at hand for distinguishing between myth and history! How the scholars staked all on the statements of Herodotus, and

how often he led them astray, and does even now! But now the monuments are before us, and history must be read and interpreted in the light of the monuments and not in the light of theories. We cannot honestly or scientifically accept the statements of the monuments when they verify our theories and reject them when they oppose. Perhaps the statements will support ninety-nine points of the theory, but if it disproves the one-hundredth it must be acknowledged. To deny or to evade is to lack in honesty.

An amazing amount of light has been shed upon the civilizations around Israel by the discoveries of the past fifty years. The ancient world is almost as well known as the world of today. We see not only the great and the mighty, but, what is, perhaps, more important as we study the life of the people of the Bible, we see the common people living their common life. We see their hopes, we know their fears, we know what manner of men they were. The monuments of Babylonia and Assyria, of Egyptians, Hittites, Phoenicians, Philistines, Moabites, Arabians, and Canaanites have been uncovered, and they speak in a language we can understand, thanks to the decipherers. As we read them we can watch the rise and fall of nations, the rise and fall of religions, and we are enabled to watch Israel take its place among the nations of the world as never before. We can watch the growth of the life, religion, and literature of Israel, and thus are enabled to form a truer estimate of each.

Chapter after chapter of the Old and New Testaments have gained new meaning in the light of archaeological

researches, and never has there been a time when opportunities were so many and great for understanding the Bible. It is a debt the responsible teachers owe to the public, especially the Bible-reading public, to give them Bible-teaching in the full light of archaeological discoveries. Archaeology is not a biased judge. If left to tell its own story it will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It has not, when left to itself, undermined conservatism, neither has it undermined criticism. It has supported and undermined parts of both, and it is useless to deny it. We are at the beginning of great days in biblical study, and it is for all who have an interest in, and knowledge of, archaeological facts to sift them and make them accessible to the general public, so that reading the Bible in this new light it will be, more than ever it has been in the past, a living guide for men.

We add a short bibliography, for which we do not attempt to claim completeness. If the student will master the books named here he will be led into larger fields and will be a workman who has no need to be ashamed.

Bibliography

BABYLONIAN EXCAVATIONS

- Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria* (6th ed.)
 Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands During the Nineteenth Century*. In this volume other Bible lands than those of Babylonia and Assyria are dealt with

PALESTINE EXCAVATIONS

- Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente*
 Bliss, *Development of Palestine Exploration; A Mound of Many Cities*, etc.

- Macalister, *Gezer* (3 vols.); *History of Civilization in Palestine*
 George Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land; Jerusalem: The Topography, Economics, and History; Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund*

ARABIAN EXPLORATION

- Hogarth, *The Penetration of Arabia* (see chapter on Arabia in Hilprecht above)

RELIGION

- Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (2 vols.)
 Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*
 Barton, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*
 W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*
 Peters, *The Religion of the Hebrews*

CODE OF HAMMURABI

- R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi*
 Johns, Article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*

CUNEIFORM TEXTS

- Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*

BEARING OF THE DISCOVERIES ON THE BIBLE

- Jeremias, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Orient*
 Driver, *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*
 Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*
 Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*
 Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Babylonia and Assyria*
 Harper, *The Bible and Modern Discoveries*. This needs to be read in the light of later researches
 Boscawen, *The Bible and the Monuments*
 Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*

Canon Sayce has written a number of books on this subject, but seeing that they are full of vagaries, and seeing that for him archaeology is a weapon wherewith to belabor higher criticism in season and out of

season, we advise the beginner not to begin with these. But, as one of our greatest Assyriologists wrote to the writer of the present article a few weeks ago, "I pardon his wild tilts against O.T. criticism because of his immense services to learning elsewhere, and because of his wonderful qualities as a gentleman, a Christian gentleman, and a friend."

This is not a specially chosen list. We have not discriminated against any save Canon Sayce, believing that the majority of writers on this theme are more concerned about enlightenment than about the supporting or attacking of this or that theory. If but one reader is led to take up the study more seriously, this article will not have been written in vain.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORSHIP, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CHILDREN'S WORSHIP

FREDERICA BEARD

Boston, Massachusetts

Miss Beard is a well-known authority in the field of education of children. Her approach is not that of the theologian or the minister, but is rather that of the teacher. It is that which makes her present treatment of so much importance. We should like to hear from our readers as to their opinion of the practicability of the work.

What is worship? As we ask the question a mental image comes before us, not only of a company of persons assembled in a sacred edifice, but of one alone with the Unseen; not only of the devout worshiper bowing down before altar or image, but of the little child bending at the mother's knee. We look farther and see the French peasant in the field standing with bowed head as he hears the call to prayer, and listen in imagination to that desert wanderer who pierces the stillness with his cry, "Allah, Allah, there is no God but one." We see the Hindu mother throwing her child into the Ganges as an offering to the gods, and we go back and back to the early days of sacrifice and ceremonial.

Then, by way of contrast, we think of the climax of worship in many a Garden of Gethsemane, and of the upward yearning for a divine presence on many a lonely mountain-top. And we ask, What does it all mean?

If we look at the matter from a psychological standpoint, one condition is evident in every instance; it may be consciously realized or it may be nascent, but there it is—a sense of need. Even if to the individual the act be a mere form imposed by external authority, the imposition implies a realization by someone of this need, while the act often creates the conscious feeling on the part of the one who performs it. The feeling and the act show an outgoing, an up-